

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants canceled claims 3, 17, and 32.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 21, 22, 24-31, 33, 35, 36, and 38-42 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Rivette (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,749) in view of Barry (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,165). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 1, 15, and 30 concern processing a source document in a structured document format including elements providing source content to render, wherein the source content comprises code that is rasterized into output, and require: receiving the source document including source content in a presentation language; receiving a layout data structure separate from the source document, providing formatting properties specifying a layout and format of the content output, wherein the layout data structure does not include source content; processing the source document and the layout data structure to determine formatting properties, including page divisions, for the content in the source document; generating multiple page objects, wherein each page object includes the source content in the presentation language used in the source document and the determined formatting properties for one page; and transmitting the page objects to a rasterizer to transform into renderable information capable of being generated by an output device.

Applicants amended claims 1, 15, and 30 as follows: to require that the source content in the source document is in a presentation language (disclosed on at least pg. 6, lines 21-25 of the Specification); to include the requirement of canceled claim 3 that the layout data structure is separate from the source document; that the layout data structure does not include source content (disclosed on at least pg. 1, line 26 to pg. 2, line 6); and that each page object includes the source content in the presentation language used in the source document (disclosed on at least pg. 8, lines 2-6).

The Examiner cited col. 3, line 30 to col. 5, line 12 of Rivette as teaching the claim requirement of processing the source document and the layout data structure to determine formatting properties, including page divisions, for the content in the source document. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner further found that the text file including patent data corresponds to the claimed source document and that the claimed layout data structure is taught by the cited image file providing an image of the patent.

Applicants traverse this rejection with respect to the amended claims that state that the layout data structure is separate from the source document and does not include source content.

The cited image file, which the Examiner likens to the claimed layout data structure, includes the same patent source content found in the text file, but in an image format. Thus, the cited image file cannot satisfy the claim requirement of a layout data structure that does not include source content because the image file includes the source content, i.e., the patent data..

Further, the cited image file does not include formatting propertyies specifying a layout and format of the content output as claimed. Instead, the image file comprises a bit map image, not formatting properties as claimed. To emphasize this distinction, Rivette discusses how the image file must be processed and interpreted to figure out the format by locating clumps, dark spaces, etc. (Rivette, cols. 21-23). Thus, the image file of Rivette does not itself include formatting properties and specify a layout. Instead, the image file needs to be scanned, processed and interpreted to determine equivalence to the text file. The image file needs to be interpreted and processed because it does not contain formatting properties specifying a layout and format of the content output, but instead includes image data.

The Examiner cited col. 1, line 24 to col. 3, line 11 of Barry as teaching the claim requirement of generating multiple page objects including the source content and formatting properties. (Final Office Action, pgs. 3-4) Applicants traverse with resepect to the amended limitation that requires that multiple page objects are generated and that each page object includes the sorce content in the presentation language used in the source document and the determined formatting properties.

The cited cols. 1-3 of Barry discuss a tandem print engine to process a print job, where the parts of the complex print job are routed to the print engines. (Barry, col. 1, line 56 to col. 2, line 7). The cited Barry further discusses using a device independent color space. The cited Barry further discusses storing bit-mapped images each formed of page data representing a page in a document downloaded from a print file and having print job parameters, and distributing these bit-mapped pages to the print engines.

The cited Barry does not teach or suggest that the page objects include the source content in the presentation language used in the source document and formatting properties. Instead, in the cited Barry, the pages comprise bit-mapped images. Thus, Barry teaches away from the page

object having the source content in the presentation language used in the source document as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, and 29 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination of art does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24-29, 33, 35, 36, and 38-42 are patentable over the cited combination of Rivette and Barry, because they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 30, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Certain of these dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 2, 16, and 30 depend from claims 1, 15, and 30 and further require that the source document includes statements in a first presentation language and transforming the source document and source content therein into a result document in a second presentation language, wherein the result document includes the source content and the formatting properties provided by the layout data structure, wherein the formatting properties indicate page divisions of the content, and wherein the multiple page objects are generated from the result document.

The Examiner cited the above discussed cols. 3-5 of Rivette as teaching the claim requirement of transforming the source document and source content therein into a result document in a second presentation language and includes formatting properties (page divisions) provided by the layout data. (Final, Office Action, pg. 8) Applicants traverse.

It is unclear what element of Rivette the Examiner believes to teach or suggest the claimed result document. Because the Examiner likens the PTO text file of Rivette to the source document and the image file to the layout data structure, then it appears the Examiner is likening the Equivalent File of Rivette to the claimed result document. Applicants submit that the cited Equivalent File does not teach or suggest the claimed result document.

The cited Rivette discusses Equivalent Files that include equivalence relationship between text and image files. Nowhere does the cited Rivette anywhere teach or suggest that the Equivalent File is in a second presentation language including source content and formatting properties provided by a layout data structure, including page divisions. Nowhere does the cited Rivette teach or suggest that the equivalent information in the Equivalent File includes the content and formatting properties from a layout data structure in a second presentation language

as claimed . Instead, the cited Equivalent File provides equivalence relationship information between the text and image, not source content and formatting properties as claimed.

Moreover, the cited Barry does not disclose a result document including formatting properties and source content in a second presentation language different from the first presentation language of the source document. Instead, the cited Barry discusses bit mapped images formed of page data representing a page in a document. Although the cited bit map images of Barry represent pages, nowhere does Barry teach or suggest that the bit mapped images include formatting properties , including page divisions, provided by a layout data structure as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 2, 16, and 31 provide additional grounds of patentability because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claims 8, 22, and 36 depend from claims 2, 16, and 30 and further require that the page objects include content and formatting properties in the second presentation language. The Examiner cited the above discussed cols. 3-5 of Rivette as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited Rivette discusses an Equivalent File including equivalence relationship between text and image files. Nowhere does the cited Rivette teach or suggest that the Equivalent File include formatting properties in a same second presentation language as the layout data structure. Instead, the cited Rivette mentions that the Equivalent File has equivalence relationship, but does not teach that the Equivalent File is in a presentation language different from the presentation language of the source documents, e.g., text or images.

Accordingly, claims 8, 22, and 36 provide additional grounds of patentability because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claims 10, 24, and 38 depend from claims 1, 15, and 29 and further require that the page objects include content and formatting properties in a device independent presentation language. The Examiner cited the above discussed cols. 3-5 of Rivette as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited Rivette discusses an Equivalent File including equivalence relationship between text and image files. Nowhere does the cited Rivette teach or suggest that the Equivalent File includes content and formatting properties in a device independent presentation language as claimed. Instead, the cited Rivette mentions that the Equivalent File has equivalence

relationship between text and image files, but does not teach or suggest that the Equivalent File is in a device independent presentation language as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 10, 24, and 38 provide additional grounds of patentability because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claims 12, 26, and 40 depend from claims 1, 15, and 29 and further require that the source document and page objects include the formatting properties in a same presentation language. The Examiner cited the above discussed cols. 3-5 of Rivette as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited Rivette discusses an Equivalent File including equivalence relationship between text and image files. Nowhere does the cited Rivette teach or suggest that the equivalence information in the Equivalent File includes formatting properties in a same presentation language as the text file, which the Examiner likens to the source document. Instead, the cited Equivalent File has equivalent relationship information between the text and image file.

Accordingly, claims 12, 26, and 40 provide additional grounds of patentability because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 6, 9, 18, 20, 23, 32, 34, and 37 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Rivette in view of Barry and further in view of Sall ("FOP: Formatting Object to PDF Translator", by James Tauber). Applicants traverse.

Claims 4, 6, 9, 18, 20, 23, 32, 34, and 37 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 29, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-16, 18-26, 28-30, 32-40, and 42 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0563.


Amdt. dated January 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 18, 2004

Serial No. 09/782,850
Docket No. BLD920000048US1
Firm No. 0036.0085

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: January 18, 2005

By: _____


David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984